

In contrast, amended independent claim 1 recites:

a display mechanism that *visually differentiates* at least one of:
multiple winning arrangements of symbols by which multiple
wins are established; and
multiple win lines related to said multiple winning
arrangements of said symbols by which said multiple wins are established,
when said evaluation module recognizes and determines that a pre-
determined combination of said symbols, in which at least one said wild symbol is
included, is arranged in such a way that said multiple wins are established by the
shared inclusion of said at least one wild symbol in at least two of said multiple
winning arrangements of symbols.

For example, when multiple winning arrangements are established that include a shared wild symbol, the display mechanism visually differentiates the arrangement of symbols that establish the wins. Thus, the player can easily recognize which arrangement of symbols has formed the win. Bennett fails to disclose this arrangement. Accordingly, Applicants submit that Bennett fails to disclose each and every element of amended claim 1 and thus, fails to anticipate claim 1. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections.

Amended claim 2 recites “a display mechanism that *visually differentiates* at least one of: multiple winning arrangements of symbols by which multiple wins are established” amended claim 8 recites “providing a *visual differentiation* of at least one of: said arrangement of said symbols by which multiple wins are established in said static display . . . ,” and claim 18 recites “providing a *visual differentiation* of at least one of: said arrangement of said symbols by which multiple wins are established in said static display” For similar reasons stated above with respect to claim 1, Applicants submit that Bennett fails to disclose visual differentiation as recited in the claims. Accordingly, Applicants submit that Bennett fails to disclose each and every element of amended claims 2, 8, and 18 and thus, fails to anticipate claims 2, 8, and 18. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections.

Claims 3, 5, and 13 depend, either directly or indirectly, from independent claim 1; claims 9 and 12 depend from independent claim 2; and claims 19 and 21 depend from independent

claim 8. Applicants submit claims 3, 5, and 13, claims 9 and 12, and claims 19 and 21 are patentable for at least the same reasons as claims 1, 2, and 8 respectively. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections.

Further, claims 3 and 9 call for a display mechanism that “*sequentially visually differentiates . . . said multiple winning arrangements of said symbols by which said multiple wins are established . . . according to each individual winning pattern established by said multiple winning arrangements of said symbols by which said multiple wins are established.*” As stated above, Applicants submit Bennett fails to disclose visual differentiation of those symbols that form a winning combination. Accordingly, Applicants submit Bennett also fails to disclose a display mechanism that “*sequentially visually differentiates . . . said multiple winning arrangements of said symbols by which said multiple wins are established . . . according to each individual winning pattern . . .*” as recited in claims 3 and 9, and the method wherein “said arrangement of said symbols by which said multiple wins are established . . . are *sequentially visual differentiated* according to each individual winning pattern established by said arrangement of said symbols by which said multiple wins are established” as recited in claim 19. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections.

Claim Rejections -- 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 4, 6, 10, 11, 20, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bennett as applied to at least claims 1-3 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,837,790 to Kaminkow (“Kaminkow”). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Bennett fails to disclose all the features of amended independent claims 1, 2, and 8 as discussed above. Kaminkow discloses a gaming device with a moving screen simulation. For example, when a predetermined combination of symbols is displayed, a bonus round is triggered, which may display screen shots of oil derricks against a solid color background. The computer

repositions the derricks and background to create the illusion the physical screen is vibrating or shaking. However, Kaminkow fails to disclose a visual indication to the game user of which symbols in combination with a wild symbol form a winning combination.

In contrast, amended independent claim 1 recites:

a display mechanism that *visually differentiates* at least one of:
multiple winning arrangements of symbols by which multiple
wins are established; and
multiple win lines related to said multiple winning
arrangements of said symbols by which said multiple wins are established,
when said evaluation module recognizes and determines that a pre-
determined combination of said symbols, in which at least one said wild symbol is
included, is arranged in such a way that said multiple wins are established by the
shared inclusion of said at least one wild symbol in at least two of said multiple
winning arrangements of symbols.

For example, when multiple winning arrangements are established that include a shared wild symbol, the display mechanism visually differentiates the arrangement of symbols that establish the wins. Thus, the player can easily recognize which arrangement of symbols has formed the win. Kaminkow fails to disclose this arrangement. Accordingly, Applicants submit neither Bennett nor Kaminkow teach or suggest all the claimed features of independent claim 1.

Amended claim 2 recites “a display mechanism that *visually differentiates* at least one of: multiple winning arrangements of symbols by which multiple wins are established . . . ,” and amended claim 8 recites “providing a *visual differentiation* of at least one of: said arrangement of said symbols by which multiple wins are established in said static display” For similar reasons stated above with respect to claim 1, Applicants submit neither Bennett nor Kaminkow teach or suggest all the claimed features of claims 2 and 8.

Claims 4 and 11 depend, either directly or indirectly, from independent claim 1; claims 6 and 10 depend from independent claim 2; and claims 20 and 22 depend from independent claim 8. Applicants submit claims 4 and 11, claims 6 and 10, and claims 20 and 22 are patentable for at least

the same reasons as claims 1, 2, and 8 respectively. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections.

Claims 7, 14-15, 17, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bennett as applied to at least claims 1-3 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,205,555 to Hamano ("Hamano"). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Bennett fails to disclose all the features of amended independent claims 1, 2, and 8 as discussed above. Hamano discloses a gaming device with bonus point multipliers. Applicants submit Hamano fails to disclose a visual indication to the game user of which symbols in combination with a shared wild symbol form a winning combination.

In contrast, amended independent claim 1 recites:

a display mechanism that *visually differentiates* at least one of:
multiple winning arrangements of symbols by which multiple wins are established; and
multiple win lines related to said multiple winning arrangements of said symbols by which said multiple wins are established,
when said evaluation module recognizes and determines that a pre-determined combination of said symbols, in which at least one said wild symbol is included, is arranged in such a way that said multiple wins are established by the shared inclusion of said at least one wild symbol in at least two of said multiple winning arrangements of symbols.

For example, when multiple winning arrangements are established that include a shared wild symbol, the display mechanism visually differentiates the arrangement of symbols that establish the wins. Thus, the player can easily recognize which arrangement of symbols has formed the win. Hamano fails to disclose this arrangement. Accordingly, Applicants submit neither Bennett nor Hamano teach or suggest all the claimed features of independent claim 1.

Amended claim 2 recites "a display mechanism that *visually differentiates* at least one of: multiple winning arrangements of symbols by which multiple wins are established . . . , " and

amended claim 8 recites “providing a *visual differentiation* of at least one of: said arrangement of said symbols by which multiple wins are established in said static display” For similar reasons stated above with respect to claim 1, Applicant submits neither Bennett nor Hamano teach or suggest all the claimed features of claims 2 and 8.

Claims 7, 15, and 17 depend, either directly or indirectly, from independent claim 1; claim 14 depends from independent claim 2; and claim 23 depends from independent claim 8. Applicants submit claims 7, 15, and 17, claim 14, and claim 23 are patentable for at least the same reasons as claims 1, 2, and 8 respectively. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections.

Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bennett in view of Kaminkow as applied to at least claim 4 above, and further in view of Hamano. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Applicants submit neither Bennett, Kaminkow, nor Hamano teach or suggest all the claimed features of independent claim 1 for the reasons stated above. Claim 16 indirectly depends from claim 1, thus claim 16 is patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections.

New claim 24 recites “a display mechanism *that visually alters the static display* displayed by the display module *to indicate the symbols that establish multiple winning arrangements* when at least two of the multiple winning arrangements of symbols are established by the shared inclusion of a common wild symbol.” Applicants submit claim 24 is distinguishable over the cited prior art for at least the reasons stated above.

CONCLUSION

Each and every point raised in the Office Action dated June 22, 2007 has been addressed on the basis of the above amendments and remarks. In view of the foregoing it is believed that claims 1-24 are in condition for allowance and it is respectfully requested that the application be reconsidered and that all pending claims be allowed and the case passed to issue.

If there are any other issues remaining which the Examiner believes could be resolved through a Supplemental Response or an Examiner's Amendment, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

Dated: December 20, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Louis J. DeJustice

Registration No.: 47,522

DARBY & DARBY P.C.

P.O. Box 770

Church Street Station

New York, New York 10008-0770

(212) 527-7700

(212) 527-7701 (Fax)

Attorneys/Agents For Applicant